

TWO PENNY-WORTH OF TRUTH

FOR A

P E N N Y;

O R

A TRUE STATE OF FACTS:

WITH

AN APOLOGY

FOR

T O M B U L L

IN A LETTER

TO

BROTHER JOHN.

L O N D O N :

Printed for the Booksellers.

1793.

N. B. Since I wrote concerning my brother Tom, accounts have been received of a riot at Cambridge; of a still worse at Manchester; and both, by those who call themselves *church-and-king-men*. These are great trials, John: but let us, who love peace, still endeavour to bear them patiently; and, though poor Tom's letter was, in part, the cause, as I have been told, yet let us rather lament, than violently exclaim; let us remember he is our brother, and that he honestly confessed *his head was turned*. Report says, he has been obliged, by his own friends, to retract part of his letter to you.

I suppose you know they talk of a war; and, what is more surprising, of a war without fresh taxes: but you and I are too old to be *so caught*: we should as soon expect a war *without men*.

They say, that the people in Brabant are at last gaining their liberties, notwithstanding their Emperors have been so long trying to prevent them: so you see,

" Let Cæsar himself do what he may,

" A Cat will mew, a Dog will have his day."



Two Penny-worth of Truth.

MY DEAR BROTHER,

I cannot refrain from communicating to you my great concern for our poor brother Tom, and the dread I have of the consequences of his present situation. You know, that in our dear parent's life time he was always inclined to have wild freaks and fancies, and too apt to misrepresent the conduct of his brethren: but this we imputed to his keeping company with our inveterate enemies, such as placemen and pensioners, high churchmen and Tories, and those families which had been known to support the Stuarts against the present royal family, whom we have so often defended with our lives and fortunes. But little did we think poor Tom would be absolutely deranged: I fear he is now as mad as Don Quixote, who took a barber's bason for Mambrino's helmet, an ale-house for an enchanted castle; and when Sancho, his man, told him he had been tossed in a blanket, cried "It was all enchantment." He once had a battle with a wind-mill, and was dreadfully alarmed at a water-mill. One time he fought with a flock of sheep, and at another with a drove of oxen, taking them for armed men! But I did not suspect our Tom would ever have been such a knight-errant. They say Don Quixote's madness brought his countrymen to their sober senses! But poor Tom's seems to have had a very contrary effect. Tom calls his letter to you "A Penny-worth of Truth;" but I verily believe there is scarcely one word of truth in it. Why, John, because people meet quietly in different parties, rejoice at the French Revolution, wish for a Reform of Parliament, and of some other abuses which have been suffered to creep into our constitution, so as to prey upon its most vital parts, Tom, you see, is frightening people out of their senses; and persuading them to associate against these harmless clubs, as if they were made up of thieves and house-breakers, enemies to all order and good government; and yet, notwithstanding what he says,

tays, London has been as quiet all this time as any city in the world; and I verily believe, that the men belonging to these very societies have contributed more to its good order, than any other set of men in the kingdom. You cannot conceive, John, how people stared, when they read the late proclamation, heard the army was drawing round London, the bank was to be double guarded, for fear of an attack, and the poor old tower fortified, ah! and victualled too, that it might hold out against all *imaginary* besiegers. I declare I never was so astonished in my life, and lay awake almost the whole night, listening whether I could hear the firing of guns, or the roaring of cannon; and, though I was not fool enough to believe there was any real danger, yet I thought it impossible, that steps *so very alarming* should be taken without actual, or, at least, *fancied* necessity. Perhaps, an anonymous letter may have been sent to the minister, another express from Brussels, or, Tom and his party may have taken innocent toasts, and moderate and sensible resolutions for high treason; a few speculative pamphlets, for a train of artillery; and the men who meet orderly in societies, for engineers, musqueteers, and soldiers with battering rams. Another idea was, that poor Tom might have dreamed that his namesake (*Tom Paine*) was coming over at the head of an army, to plead his own cause at his trial for a libel, and that he had taken the dream for a real fact. Why, he might as easily believe that, as believe that Tom Paine ever talked of trying his hand at a revolution in heaven! I fear, John, the father of that lie, will never go there to see. But talk of libels, I am sure our Tom, in his letter to you, has libelled us, and the French too, to some purpose; and I think he would be in a sad scrape, only it seems the A-----y G-----l does not attend to libels *against poor John Bull*; and he has not libelled the late queen of France, or else he might have fared no better than poor lord George Gordon. Now, John, you know the old saying, "What is sauce for a goose, is sauce for a gander," had we spoken as falsely of the court, or courtiers, or of the constitution, or indeed, had we spoken truly, (for they say it may be the more a libel for being true) we might have been soon dragged to prison, though our families had been left to starve

starve. The French had many of these inequalities to complain of, and bore them long with patience, for they seemed to love their king better than themselves.

"They say its an ill wind that blows nobody good." Now it happened, that the French nation, through the *extravagance* of the court, and the *bad management of the administration*, was in very great distress for want of money; and, at the same time, there was a great scarcity of provisions, which added so much to the grievances of the people, that they were determined to bear them no longer. The ministry, therefore, were obliged to require the assistance of an assembly, which I think they called the Notables; but they were not equal to the task, and separated without relieving either the court, or the people. Distress continuing, and the court having in vain tried every other expedient, they were obliged to call a National Assembly, to reform the constitution, and, if possible, to prevent a national bankruptcy. After going through many difficulties and dangers, owing to the opposition of the enemies of reform; and, after much labour of mind, they seemed to have succeeded. But, so very fond were the French of their king, that although he had perjured himself, and fled in order to join the enemy, yet did they chuse him for their chief magistrate; allowed him an enormous income, and so much power, that if they had let him reign three days longer than they did, their liberties must have been destroyed, and the combined forces of foreign despots would have deluged the nation with the blood of the patriots.

Now, my dear brother, although you know I love peace, quiet, and good order, and would do much to prevent bloodshed, yet I honestly confess, that whenever there is a contest, I always wish the oppressed may triumph, and rejoice to see Liberty lay Despotism at her feet.

Now, John, you may recollect, that we met and rejoiced, that the French had preferred a limited monarchy to a republic; yet, because it was called a revolution, I suppose, for I could never find out a better reason, the people who met, were abused, and such lying paragraphs inserted in the papers, under the management of poor Tom's friends, as could not fail raising the indignation of every

friend to humanity and truth; but conscious of their virtue, they disdained to bring the libellers to justice.

But to return to the French. The king being suspended, and now really a prisoner, the National Assembly saw the necessity of the people's taking the cause into their own hands; and, very properly, called upon them to exert their inherent right, and to make a new election of representatives, to meet in convention, for the express purpose of determining, what was to be done respecting their late king, and to form a new constitution. It soon appeared to be the wish of the people, that the kingly office should cease, and, that their new constitution should be formed upon the broad basis of equality; not that they expect, or desire, that every man should be equally rich, or that every man should have an equal right to his neighbour's property, as poor Tom would make you believe, for that would be taking away the right every man has to his own property. But, they expect, that their new constitution should be equally favourable to the rich and to the poor, and that all should be equal in the eye of the law (which *they say*, John, is our case at present) As for an absolute equality of riches, it would be impossible; for, if men were equally rich to day, they would not be so to-morrow: riches will fluctuate; they will increase with the prudent and industrious; and they will be dissipated by the idle, the luxurious, and extravagant: but indeed I do not believe either Tom, or anybody else, ever *really* supposed the French had any idea so wild, as an equal division of property. And, if Tom and his friends *really* look upon the *multitude* as *fools*, I am sure *they are not wise* in putting such thoughts into their heads. Lies, John, never do any real good; they are like the Will-with-the-Wisp to the benighted traveller, and may lead into as dangerous errors; but truth will in time break forth, like the sun, and discover the deception, in spite of P—'s taxes, or the prohibitions of arbitrary Associations.

Do you think so many of the poor soldiers in their armies, who have been so bravely fighting for liberty and their country, would be so long in distress for shoes and cloathing, if they thought they had an equal right to their neighbour's property? Would they refrain from pillaging the
the

the towns they take possession of? Would they not cloathe themselves with the spoils of the inhabitants, if they did not respect the right of private property, and disdain to follow the example so frequently set them by the armies of Despots? A clear case, John. Nor did the French suppose that every man had an equal right to be elected into any office, unless he were equally qualified. A man must learn to drive before he has a right to the place of a coachman; and a man's fitness to govern, must depend upon his wisdom, his love of justice, and his rendering himself, in every respect, deserving the confidence of the public. So far from supposing, that every man is born fit for every station, and has a right to be in any situation, for which he is not properly qualified, that it seems to be in order to *guard against such evils*, that they are determined to have no hereditary governors. Their new constitution must not say, that man shall be a ruler, whether he be a wise man, or a fool: that man shall be a judge if he can but purchase the office, although he be ignorant of the law, and too partial to decide according to justice: that man shall be a lord, and shall have privileges granted to him, which will tempt him to be haughty to his neighbour, and a tyrant to the poor, who must bow down to him whether worthy or unworthy. Their new constitution must not prevent the peasant from enjoying in safety the poor pittance he earns by the sweat of his brow, must not deprive him of the means of making a provision for his family, or of the pleasing consolation, that poverty is no bar to merit. And yet, Tom would make you believe, that a poor man cannot leave what he earns to bring up his children: whereas the property of the poor, and the liberty of disposing of it, are equally secured to the poor and the rich. The miserable state of the poor, under the old form of government, they say, was beyond our conception.

Ought we not, therefore, to rejoice? Ought we not to congratulate them upon the recovery of their liberty? And, Is it not a proof of our poor Tom's wildness, that he endeavours to provoke them now they are become worthy to be our friends, and wish for our friendship? When they had a king, we called them, though unjustly, our natural enemies, and boasting of our own freedom, held them in

contempt; and treated them as slaves and cowards, because they submitted to an *arbitrary government*: and, now they have had the wisdom and the courage to break their chain, and are going to make a constitution, in which the rich and poor will be equally considered, will have an equal right to whatever by their labour or abilities they may earn, an equal *hope* of rising to higher stations, if they render themselves deserving in the eye of their fellow-citizens, (but observe, John, not unless they are deserving) In short, when they have just given substantial proofs, that they deserve to be called *men*, Tom calls them conceited monkeys; and, because they have given proofs of their wisdom, Tom supposes them to be fools; fancies the master is to be set upon the coach-box, and the coachman to get into the coach; the footman to sit at the head of the table; the thief to take his place on the bench instead of the judge; and very gravely tells us "The child is not equal to the mother." Poor Tom may well talk of his head turning round: why, he out-quixotes Quixote. Now, suppose for a moment yourself to be a French-man, with the right of chusing your own judge, coachman, priest, and governor: Do you think you would not endeavour to chuse men fit for their several stations? And though, it is possible, you might think one child *born equal* to another, you would not expect that all children when grown up, would be *equally good coachmen*? and therefore you would take the man who had learned to drive: nor, would you think a lad fit to govern old men, and, consequently, would not make him a Minister of State. You may remember how we complained, some years ago, that a lad was set upon our state coach-box, and that Tom's friends wanted to persuade us, this minister, was an heaven-born driver; but we, who were driven, received many a terrible jolt which we feel to this day; and, that we were not overturned into the mire, was more owing to good roads, and tractable horses, than to the skill or *sobriety* of the driver. And you may remember, that the Swine (as poor Tom's friend Burke calls us) were very near being driven into a battle with the russian bears, for a mere trifle, which we were to have paid dearly for, and the driver into the bargain. But, that was for the balance of power, which
now

now, I recollect, we are to be *muzzled* from speaking of; and, * * * * * but, mum—for fear of the Mayor.—The poor lads in the city were forced to run for it; there was no balancing with constables at their heels: yet, perhaps, the debates of these young orators might have been less dangerous to the peace of the country, than some of those inflammatory ones, which have had the sanction of grey hairs.

Tom says, God is never called king of republics, and therefore *wisely* seems to conclude, that those nations who have no king, are not under the protection of the Almighty! But, Is not God king of the whole world, and, consequently, of all the people in it? Must he not therefore be king of a Republic, as well as of a Monarchy? But Tom's poor head could not reach that! Because he had never heard of an *anointed Republic*! Now that might have been some reason, if he had ever heard of an *anointed Monarchy*, or had ever felt the holy oil trickle down his own head, as one of the people of England.

Tom asserts that “no nation, but the Jews, ever were, “or ever will be in a state of equality, and that *they* are in “such a state for the punishment of their sins.” Now if no other nation will ever be in a state of equality, Why all this alarm? And, besides, I do not perceive any thing very horrible in the *equality* between the Jew who cries old cloaths about the street, and the great Decosta. And with respect to their not being “good enough to have a “king”—if they have not a Jewish king, they have a Christian king; and, surely, Tom would not dare to insinuate that our king is not as good as Saul, aye, or as David either. The punishment of the Jews, I humbly conceive, consists more in their having no *country* of their own, than no king, being scattered over the face of the earth; and in suffering shame and reproach in the various countries they inhabit.

But nothing proves poor Tom's disorder so much as his endeavouring to prove from scripture the *wickedness* of the Republican System. He forgets we can read our bible as well as he can; and, though we may not be so fond of quoting it, either for, or against any form of government; yet, as he quotes that book for the purpose of abusing

abusing the French, and misleading his brethren, truth and justice obliges me to quote the same book in reply. Whoever reads the History of the Jews, will find, that favoured people had originally no kings, and yet, when God had blessed and multiplied them, Moses said to them, * *"Take ye wise men and understanding, and known among your tribes; and I will make them rulers over you;"* and *the people approving of that,* "Moses made them Captains over hundreds and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among their tribes†;" and God gave them the land of Canaan, which they conquered and took possession of, and slew mighty kings, but at that time had no king to govern them. But, perceiving the nations around them had kings, and that the prophet Samuel grew old, they desired him to make them a king to "judge them like all the nations:" and Samuel was displeased; but the Lord said to him, "they have not rejected you, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them." Yet, the Lord told Samuel to hearken unto their voice, but first to protest to them and show them the manner of the king, that should reign over them, and Samuel gave them a very alarming description of a king, "Nevertheless the people were obstinate, and refused to obey the voice of Samuel, so God permitted Samuel to make them a king‡." Now, certainly this is no proof of the wickedness of the French in refusing to have a king; yet, John, we certainly have as much right to have a king, as they have to reject one; and it may be as wise and as prudent in us to support our Monarchical Government, as it was in the French to destroy theirs; but we cannot with any *shadow of truth* say, that it is wicked in them to reject that form of government, which you see was far from being recommended by God to his favoured people. But in one thing I must confess the French greatly erred—before they elected their late king, they should have read the 17th chapter of Deuteronomy, v. 16—20. where the people, in case they should chuse a king, are advised to "chuse one from among their brethren, and are particu-

* Deut. c. i. v. 13. † v. 15. * Sam. c. viii. v. 4 to the end.

larly cautioned against letting him multiply horses to himself, or silver, or gold, that his heart be not lifted up against his brethren, and that he turn not to the right hand or to the left, to the end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom." Now, John, many people think, that if the French king had not been generously allowed so enormous an income, and had had less power given to him, he would never have acted in such a manner, as to make his dethronement so absolutely necessary. You have heard talk of giving a man rope enough, &c. but money and power will sometimes answer the same end. However, notwithstanding all I have said, I assure you I grieve much for Lewis: you know kings seldom hear the truth, have bad advisers, and may be deceived as easily as you or I can be. He was, at first, of some service to the cause: so I would preserve his life, though I would take care to put it out of his power to destroy others. The French should recollect, that they put it in his power to ruin their cause, when they gave him the liberty of refusing his assent to a decree of the National Assembly, and took from him all fear for his personal safety, in case he should use that liberty improperly, by declaring his person to be inviolable. Now, whether they acted wisely or not, circumstanced as they were at the time, yet certainly these are reasons for not taking away his life. But, surrounded with difficulties and dangers, some through fear, others, through intemperate zeal, and perhaps provoked by the injudicious attempts of his friends to raise insurrections in his favour, they may be induced to believe that *his life* is incompatible with the safety of the Republic: if so, I tremble for the consequence; and believe they will too late lament it. The swinish multitude are not destitute of humanity: do not make them mad, and they can feel, as sensibly, at least, as Mr. Burke himself does, who seems so much concerned for the *few in high stations*, that he has not a sigh to spare for the *multitude*. I mourn sincerely for all the blood which has been shed on either side; but I must be just: I must lay the most blame where most is due. If there were no violent party to oppose *necessary changes*, or *reforms*, we should never have cause to lament such dreadful effusions of human blood

blood. You scarce ever heard of a nation rising against their chief magistrate, till resistance was become almost a virtue.

Our brother Tom is not very fortunate in his appeals to the New Testament. He tells us "Jesus was crucified for calling himself king of the Jews:" yet Jesus came not to govern, but to instruct; he came to declare the will of God, and to bear witness unto the truth; and the common people (the swine of that day) heard him gladly*, and would indeed have made him a king; but, if you read John vi. v. 15. you will find, that when Jesus perceived, that they would come and take him by force to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone, and speaking to Pilate, he says, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants (meaning subjects) fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews†." But, it seems Jesus was a great reformer: and the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Chief Priests and Rulers hated Reforms, and would not listen to the truth, though it was to make them wise unto salvation. And they falsely accused Jesus, saying "We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar‡:" and when Pilate would have released him as innocent of the charges, which the many false witnesses brought against him, the *Chief Priests moved the people* to cry "Crucify him, crucify him," and to desire that he would rather release unto them Barabbas the robber. But observe, I quote scripture merely to reply to Tom's misrepresentations, and not to prove any thing against the kingly office; for I do not see, that Jesus gave any directions about forms of government, and, therefore, we have a right to please ourselves. And, we have every reason to conclude, that the form of government, which is most likely to make us happy, and virtuous, must be the form most pleasing to the Almighty, who is a God of *love*, as well as a God of *order*.

I never could perceive why Tom calls the French, levellers, unless it be because they have taken away all

* Mark xii. v. 37. † John xviii. v. 36. * Luke xxiii. v. 2.

titles of nobility. You know, brother, they say a king *can* make a lord, but cannot make a gentleman. Now, the French lords were most of them tyrants, and the French people were determined to make them gentlemen: with some of the best of them they easily succeeded, for wise men know they shall be respected without titles; and men of fortune can always, by a proper behaviour, make themselves beloved by their neighbours; this we know by experience. And now, John, if our lords are not tyrants, What can they have to fear from us? For, What signifies whether they *be all gentlemen* or not? We are not fools, and therefore shall not quarrel about such *trifles* as titles. You and I know well enough, that if a lord be poor, as many of the French lords were, put him into one scale, and a rich citizen into the other, and plumb will weigh down the title.

Poor Tom *raves* as much against the Dissenters, as he does against the French, and with still less reason, as they have always been great supporters of the king, as well as honest and peaceable subjects. Too much mischief has already been done by inflammatory invectives. I believe it is generally supposed, that the many lying paragraphs, which were inserted into certain news-papers, supposed to be under the direction of Tom's friend, were in a great measure the cause of raising that infernal spirit against the Dissenters at Birmingham. You may remember that when some Dissenters and other gentlemen met to celebrate the revolution, in which the French *retained the kingly office*, a desperate banditti, who called themselves, church-and-king-men, were guilty of such atrocious acts of violence against those innocent members of society, that one might have imagined there had been neither church, nor king, nor laws in England: and yet we never heard of any associations to protect the property of the Dissenters, no meetings in favour of their liberty, nor pamphlets distributed to undeceive the people! No! the people are still deluded, the same spirit is still encouraged, and the same consequences, it is to be feared, will again follow. Oh John! this is an inequality, which I would willingly hope, for the sake of peace, as well as justice, we shall not lament in vain. But I must confess upon reading Tom's letter again,

again all hope of peace, for the present, is destroyed: for, What can tend more to a breach of the peace, than Tom's asserting the Dissenters were the cause of the American war, and the increase of taxes? Does he forget, that his own friends were in power at that time, and, that the people, though deceived by artful misrepresentations, and flattered that their taxes would be lessened, instead of increased, for a time patiently submitted; yet soon recovered their understanding? Has he forgotten that Dissenters, Churchmen, and Quakers joined cordially in reprobating that unjust, cruel, unwise, and fatal war? Has he forgotten, how all the friends of liberty united in petitioning against it? But, if there are now in England any lovers of the republican system, how must they rejoice that their petitions were rejected! and, that an infatuated party, deaf to the cries of justice and humanity, continued to raise that spirit, which is now making such progress, as may in due time give liberty to the globe!

Poor Tom seems to think, there are no laws in a Republic! What does he think of Holland? Do the Dutch live without laws? Have not the Americans laws? Ah! and good ones too, one may suppose, for we do not hear they find it necessary to associate against those who write and speak freely, or for the preservation of liberty and property, as if one part of the people were tyrants, and the other rioters, thieves, and plunderers. Does Tom think the Romans, those brave men we have heard our schoolmaster talk so much about, had no laws? Why they say, John, they were greater and better men before they were governed by emperors, than they were afterwards. And what is become of them now, think you? Why! the *Emperor lost the Empire!* One Gibbon has written many books about it. Tom's friends will say, "this knowledge comes by reading—that the common people should be kept in ignorance:" and yet I never knew a man make the worse servant for being able to read his duty. But whether ignorant or learned, Do they think calling honest men rogues and rascals, imputing bad designs to them, and making it dangerous for them either to talk, or read, or attend convivial meetings, is the way to keep the peace, or to convince them of any *peculiar* blessings which

which belong to our present form of government? Can any thing be more likely to make people *dissatisfied*, and to *provoke* riot and confusion, than to calumniate whole bodies of men; to call them wicked republicans and levellers, without any foundation given by them, in any resolution they have passed at their meetings? Can any thing tend more to *exasperate*, than to tax them with wishing to destroy liberty and property, when, if we may judge by their conduct, we must believe their desire is to *preserve both*, and to increase the happiness of all? May the numerous clubs be libelled with safety, while yet you and I dare now scarce utter a simple truth, lest it should be offensive to the new court of starchamber, set up by the self-elected dictators at the C---n and A---r? Can you believe it possible, that spies are now encouraged by public advertisements to destroy private happiness; and that such very high rewards are offered to informers, as it is *more than probable* will tempt the guilty to accuse the innocent, to the destruction of his fortune, his liberty, and his fame? If we were to act thus, it would be called *bribery and corruption*.

Tom says, where there is no law, "there is *people Thomas* against *people John*." Now, Who can read a certain association-advertisement without perceiving they are ringing the alarm-bell, and founding the trumpet of division, for people Thomas to form a phalanx against people John; and, under the *pretence* of preserving liberty and property, to support placemen and pensioners in their arbitrary exertions against liberty of speaking, writing, and reading? And, Who can help perceiving, that all this is to enable them, with the greater ease, to continue to drain the pockets of the people, and to deprive them of that substantial reform, which they deem so necessary to the peace, the liberty, and happiness of the nation?

Some people may think that eyes and understanding are confined to the great and the learned: I wish they would let us see they can make a good use of them. I have heard that an ounce of a man's own sense is worth a ton of other people's: however that be, I think it is very clear that an ounce of *common sense* without learning, is better than a ton of *learning* without common sense. Ah! John, common sense, and common honesty would make excellent

lent statesmen, and soon put a stop to all revolutions: you understand me. Why, to be sure, they would soon find a plan to make them unnecessary, and, Would not that be better than arbitrary associations against reformers, or the still more violent measure of dragooning the people? As for the *Bull family*, let them but be well fed, and their own house put into thorough repair, so that every man's own voice, either by himself or his representative may have its due weight; and have annual parliaments, to secure the members from corrupt influence; and the whole family (trusting that every other necessary reform would follow of course) would soon astonish the world with their tameness. You know they are never wild unless much *irritated*: to say the truth, they are not always in a humour to be called names: call them bad names, and set the dogs upon them, and you may provoke them to madness; and, then, indeed they care not whether they find a china shop, or a lord in their way; down they go, 'tis all one to them: but, you know, when this happens, even in Smithfield, it is almost always the fault of the driver. Experience should make even fools wise.

I conclude with wishing Tom's speedy recovery, and assuring you,

I am, dear Brother,

Yours affectionately,

— BULL.

P. S. Dec. 20.

As I have kept my letter some days, I can now inform you, that the loyalty of the people breaks out even into acts of violence. "God save great George our king," is played two or three times a night at the theatres, where there are as many repeated hallowings and shoutings. They sing it at the corners of the streets, play it at the doors, and serenade the windows at midnight, that the people may dream of royalty; and, besides all this, they hawk it about the streets, as an amulet against republicanism. It is possible, indeed; there may be something of the Pharisee in this conduct; for, though I am neither singer, nor musician, I verily believe I am as great a lover of the king, as many of those who seem to weary heaven with prayers for his long life, and with imprecations upon his fancied enemies.



